



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of Cushing, Davis, and Moore. As the author addresses himself, however, principally to a popular audience this is in no sense an unfavorable criticism of the book. What is distinctly original is in the form of personal reminiscences, as the title promises. A recently circulated story Mr. Hackett lays to rest. Credit has been given to the late Mr. B. F. Stevens, at the time despatch-agent for the United States at London, for saving his country's case. The story is that duplicate copies of the American case failed to arrive at London at the proper time, and that Mr. Stevens by adroit and extraordinary efforts managed to have the case put into type, duplicate copies printed, and these served upon the British agent within the required time. Mr. Hackett declares the story to be inherently improbable, contradicted by notorious facts, and an ungrounded reflection upon the methods of the State Department at an important crisis.

The book may be commended as a welcome addition to the lighter literature of international arbitration. It is additionally welcome in that the writer displays a keen sense of humor.

JESSE S. REEVES.

The Village Labourer—1760–1832. A Study in the Government of England before the Reform Bill. By J. L. and BARBARA HAMMOND. (New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1911. Pp. x, 418.)

There has been accumulating in recent years a little library of books by students, based on careful research, in which is directly or indirectly challenged the long persistent tradition of the great indebtedness of England to its governing class. Among the more noteworthy of these are Fortescue's history of the army and its organization during the long wars with France at the end of the eighteenth century and in the first two decades of the nineteenth; Hasbach's *History of the English Agricultural Laborer*; and Jephson's *Sanitary Evolution of London*, which is in the main the history of the long neglect by the governing class of local government in the thickly populated parishes of the metropolis. Only indirectly is the governing class of the period before 1867 indicted in any of these books; and in this respect they differ from Mr. and Mrs. Hammond's study of the political, economic, and social conditions of rural England in the reigns of George III, George IV, and William IV.

Bright, in a speech at Birmingham in 1858, declared that there was no actuary in existence who could calculate how much of the wealth, of the strength, and of the supremacy of the territorial families in England had been derived from "an unholy participation in the fruits of the industry of the people, which had been wrested from them by every device of taxation." Mr. and Mrs. Hammond's book, which is an analysis of the causes of the appalling condition of the working class in rural England between the beginning of the war with France in 1792 and the Reform Act in 1832, is not written in the spirit of an actuary. But it is intended to show from the many authoritative sources now available, what rule by the aristocratic land-owning and governing class meant in this period for the common people of the English villages, whom the enclosure enactments of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, carried through Parliament by the governing class and in their interest, had completely divorced from the ancient rights of the people in waste lands and commons.

At three of the great crises in English history before 1832 there had been changes that were adverse to the interests of the people at large—all changes made for the aggrandisement of the governing class. At the Reformation tithes which before this time had gone partly to the relief of the poor, were diverted to the exclusive use of the church, or into the possession of laymen. At the Restoration the land-owning class relieved itself from the burden of furnishing the Crown with military aid and while it retained its feudal rights as lords of the manor, it threw the cost of national defence on the people at large. But it was at the revolution of 1688 that the governing class made its greatest gain. From that time until 1832 it was in undisputed control of Parliament and of all the machinery of local government in rural England; and from the Revolution until the Reform Act, and especially during the last seventy years of this period, it used its political power for its own material gain, and to safeguard or increase its feudal privileges.

Practically all this material gain, as Mr. and Mrs. Hammond show, and with ample authority for every statement they make, so far as rural England was concerned was at the expense of the common people, whose condition in the forty years that preceded the Reform Act was more depressed, more hopeless, and more miserable, than at any time since serfdom had disappeared from England. It was the period in which were built most of the great palaces which today adorn the English shires; in which great fortunes were made in trade and

manufacturing by men who at this time began to bribe and intrigue for baronetcies and peerages in order to elbow their way into the aristocratic and governing class. It was the period too in which tenant farmers began to keep hunters and servants in livery. Enormous wealth accrued to the great land-owners, and tenant farmers shared in the prosperity. But it was the period in which the laboring class began to be described as "the lower orders" and the "mob"—in which the governing class and the prosperous trading and manufacturing class, took it for granted that the poverty of the "lower orders" was their inevitable and hereditary lot; and in which through causes mostly of a statutory origin the wages of farm laborers sank much below subsistence level, and in which the Speenhamland system, of evil notoriety in English poor law history, was devised to prevent increases in wages which might have become permanent, and thereby reduce the rent of farms. Its culmination before 1832 was the revolt of the laborers in thirteen of the southern and south-western counties. This was the last laborers' revolt in English history. It was suppressed by such drastic measures by the newly-installed Grey Administration that six men were hanged, and 457 boys and men were transported to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales.

There is not a chapter in Mr. and Mrs. Hammond's book which fails to throw new light on enclosures, or on the administration of the poor laws and the game laws; and on the economic and social conditions of the period. If any chapters can be singled out as of special value, they are Chapters XI and XII (pages 240-324) in which the history of the revolt of 1830 is told with great detail, much of it based on Home Office papers now drawn upon for the first time for this episode in the history of the English rural laborer. The tradition of the debt of gratitude of England to its governing class—the tradition on which as recently as 1866 was based the theory that the land-owning class is of singular value, social and political to the nation, and that the nation therefore would do wisely to make some sacrifice for its benefit, is most persistent. A few other studies of governing class rule before 1867 as searchingly analytical as Mr. and Mrs. Hammond's book will do much to weaken this tradition, and to make imperative much recasting of English history from 1688.

E. P.